DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 407 HE 004 634

TITLE	The Church--The Student--And The Future.
INSTITUTION	Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	53p.; Paper and proceedings of the 59th annual convention, Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, San Francisco, California, January 73
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Related Colleges; Conference Reports; *Educational Administration; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Programs; *Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Private Colleges; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This document contains the papers and proceedings of the 59th annual convention of the Lutheran Education Conference of North America. The purpose of the conference was to consider problems in higher education, especially those related to Lutheran higher education. Further, it seeks to share information, suggest strategy, and assist member institutions in their programs. The president's report concerns the effectiveness of church colleges in the future and the changes necessary to improve their image. The attitudes of Lutherans towards church colleges is treated in the second paper. Following these papers are summaries of research projects on "The Changing Attitudes of College Students and Implications for Church Related Colleges" and Religious Behavior and American Society." Also included is the Secretary-Treasurer's report on membership, budget, and enrollment. The document contains a record of conventions and officers, and institutional presidents. (Author/PG)

ED 081407

THE CHURCH-- THE STUDENT-- AND THE FUTURE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 634

Papers and Proceedings, 1973

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081407

THE CHURCH-- THE STUDENT-- AND THE FUTURE

Papers and proceedings
of the 59th Annual Convention
Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

San Francisco Hilton Hotel
San Francisco, California
January 12-13, 1973

LECNA

The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America traces its history to 1910, making it possibly the oldest inter-Lutheran organization. It was reconstituted in 1967 for its predecessor, the former National Lutheran Educational Conference.

The purpose of the Conference is to consider problems in higher education, especially those related to Lutheran higher education. Further, it seeks to share information, suggest strategy, and assist member institutions in their programs.

LECNA functions as a free forum in which representatives of Lutheran institutions of higher education, boards, organizations, and individuals discuss the problems and concerns of Lutheran higher education, collegiate or theological.

The papers and proceedings which follow are the product of LECNA's 59th annual convention, held once again this year, after two years of self-standing conventions, in conjunction with the convention of the Association of American Colleges at the San Francisco Hilton Hotel in San Francisco, California.

Much of the interest of the convention was in the newly established Commission on the Future and the projects it potentially could mount to help the schools cooperatively plan for a future of service.

This concern for the future also revealed itself in featured program speakers who concentrated on student beliefs and attitudes and the beliefs and attitudes of church constituency to which the colleges are so closely related. This emphasis coincided with the concern of the early meetings of the Commission which stressed that whatever new plans or arrangements were developed, paramount interest should be in service to the students who attend the Lutheran colleges and universities, and to the constituencies which support them.

Robert L. Anderson
Editor

The office of LECNA is now located at 955 L'Enfant Plaza, S. W., Washington, D. C. 20024.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

President's Report	ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON	5
Attitudes of Lutherans Towards Church Colleges	NORMAN D. FINTEL	9
59th Annual Program		29
Program Highlights		31
Report of Secretary-Treasurer		38
Report of the Resolutions Committee		46
Board of Directors, 1973		48
Institutional Presidents		49
Record of Conventions and Officers		51

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON
President
Wagner College

Change will take place whether we want it or not, and we must exercise that kind of leadership that will direct us to changes that are desirable . . . There is a softening, a tendency to be like other institutions, and to lose any uniqueness we may have. We must halt the momentum and change the direction.

We are now ready to begin a concentrated day on matters of mutual interest at this our 59th annual meeting.

One could say that this is the most important and crucial conference of these fifty-nine meetings, but we say this so often at what turns out to be regular or ordinary conferences. Yet, I feel it is true in many ways. We had years when we felt that we had the answers. We had acceptable statements of purpose — understandings with our Church, Synod, or district; no real challenges by faculty, students, alumni, or community. Then we had our years of intense unrest and violence and we said that these were the important years, the crisis years. We were frantically meeting daily problems — putting out fires — every public seemed to be questioning — logic seemed to diminish — and we were frustrated because our time and our energies were being spent mainly on non-academic matters.

Now things seemed to have cooled — violence is not expected. But, has it cooled? The questioning is still here. The unrest and dissatisfactions are still here. Students will continue to express themselves but probably in ways more logical, less emotional and more universal than previously. In spite of the unrest of the sixties and our various solutions, the fundamental and real problem still exists at most of our colleges — ineffective teaching and an inadequate curriculum. The students have been coming to us in recent years with a greater readiness for learning and we have not satisfied them with our teaching and offerings. The great majority of our students have been dissatisfied for these reasons for some time but not dissatisfied enough to do much about it until the organizers came in during the sixties and capitalized on this unrest. Many of the

rebellion years were years of outside influence and of planted leaders who took advantage of justifiable unrest by our students.

Now reason has come back to a degree but until we improve our teaching and offerings we are going to have a basic dissatisfaction present that will not go away.

Now may I call your attention to two studies that have occupied quite a bit of my time during the last two years.

One was on Public Policy and Church-Related Education. The Study Committee consisted of eight representatives from the ALC and the LCA. It was staffed by officers of all three of the large Lutheran Church bodies. The report was given to the LCA Convention in Dallas last July and also to the ALC Convention in Minneapolis last October. The report included eleven pertinent considerations, eight affirmations, and five conclusions. Dr. Carlson prepared a study guide for those who wished to carry on discussions.

One purpose of the study is stated in the introduction, "In view of the rapidly changing conditions in the field of higher education, the Lutheran churches must review their role as sponsors of colleges and universities. Church leaders and church members need to be aware of the way their own programs are affected by public policies." Then in the Preamble we find this statement: "Members of churches are also citizens and as citizens share responsibility for the making of public policies, in education as elsewhere. They should be prepared to exercise this right and to discharge their responsibility with regard to these public policies. The following statement is submitted in the interests of fostering such good and enlightened citizenship."

Another project is the **Commission on the Future** on which you will have a discussion later this morning. This study goes back to 1970 when Dr. Gamelin made a study of Lutheran colleges and universities at the request of the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. He reported on his study at our annual meeting two years ago.

In his paper he recommended the formation of a Commission on the Future. The purpose of this commission would be "to focus light from history, current experience, and futuristics upon Lutheran aspirations and plans in higher education. It would be a study commission, periodically reporting its findings and recommendations to the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America in a form transmissible to individual colleges and church bodies." In March

1972 the LECNA Board of Directors took action to implement Dr. Gamelin's suggestions for a Commission on the Future. In October 1972 as president of LECNA, I called the first meeting of the Commission and it organized itself with Dr. Huegli as chairman. The enthusiasm and progress at both the October and the December meeting of this Committee signify that this is no ordinary study nor does its membership consist of ordinary people.

Another study in which I was only indirectly involved (as a member of the Lutheran Brotherhood committee which approved the study and financing which has grown to over $400,000 in money and time) is **The Study of Generations.** Dr. Fintel and others will be referring to it this morning. It is an outstanding study and gives much needed information to those who are planning the future of our Church, our local congregations, and our colleges. It has special significance for those of us in education for what it reveals not only about young people but our generation of Lutherans. Careful study of its findings will suggest new approaches in our planning. It has highly practical application as well as being an example of excellent scholarship.

These studies emphasize the fact that great changes are taking place in our society, our Church, and our colleges. Change will take place whether we want it or not and we must exercise that kind of leadership that will direct us to changes that are desirable. One has to anticipate many directions and take early action because by the time actual resolution is needed the situation may have reached a point where little freedom of choice is possible.

Too often the church and her institutions have not anticipated the critical moments of decision. Hence we have reacted to events rather than shape them. We cannot afford to be caught unaware. We should be among the shaping forces which determine the course of the future of higher education.

One of the biggest problems facing us is how to be effective church colleges, now and in the future. Many say we are no longer effective, unique or even necessary. It seems quite obvious that we will have to make some changes to even exist and that considerable change will have to take place to improve our image and effectiveness.

Each of us must determine how our own particular college can be effective. Wagner in New York City has to use different ways to be an effective church college than if it was in Montana. The definitions of ten, twenty, or thirty years ago for all us do not

necessarily fit today, although some of the basics may never change. We may have had a good successful pattern but it may be necessary to change to remain effective. We must constantly evaluate our directions. It is my conviction that we must remain independent and private; and that we should strengthen, not weaken, our connection with the church. We must not sell our soul for State Aid. We should be creative and, hard as it is in this particular period of tight budgets, set some money aside for opportunities to experiment with ideas. Not only should administrations provide conditions so that effective teaching can take place, but also provide an atmosphere where people can be creative.

One of the usual things done by all is preparing a statement of purpose. A statement of purpose is necessary and must be constantly evaluated. It is easy to write a statement — it is almost impossible to write one that has real meaning and guidance.

When I was at Luther I was chairman of a committee to prepare a statement of purpose. After twenty-three meetings of the committee and the faculty, the faculty finally agreed on the first two paragraphs. After almost twelve years at Wagner we are constantly trying to improve our statement. Meanwhile, we presidents, while constantly striving for the perfect statement, can surround ourselves with key people who have a background in the church, understand our kind of college, and who, as individuals, will have a positive influence on the students. In this way the day by day decisions of these people will be in the general direction of what we should be as church colleges.

You have only to observe what is going on in your faculty, your administration, your church to be aware that there is a softening, a tendency to be like other institutions, and to lose any uniqueness we may have. We must halt the momentum and change the direction.

Each of us must do that which is necessary in our own area but each of us needs much help and guidance. A strong vital LECNA is greatly needed. I come back to one of my early statements — that this is a most critical time in the history of our church colleges and seminaries and that what we do at this meeting and in the immediate future and what our Commission on the Future comes up with will help us to determine how to point our institutions in desired directions.

Attitudes of Lutherans Toward Church Colleges

NORMAN D. FINTEL

Both in theology and attitudes there seems to be little to keep Lutheran colleges from cooperation and coordination, or to keep us from uniting to face the common challenges of the future. The church expects and deserves that kind of leadership from its colleges.

Many television programs begin with a flash-forward technique which tells you what is coming in the rest of the show. This is done in the hope that you will stick around for the entire show, commercials and all. I want to use that technique and take my chances that you will stick around.

The poking and probing of my studies of Lutherans during the past few years have led to a number of findings, some tentative hypotheses, and a host of curiosities. These findings and ruminations should not surprise the present company of Lutheran educators — and I include in that class all who have chosen to align themselves with the Lutheran church by accepting responsible positions with Lutheran Colleges. Not all of us need to be Lutheran, but we all need to know much more about Lutheran theology and about that part of the constituency which calls themselves Lutheran.

Some of the more obvious findings follow.

—Lutherans are largely middle and upper-middle class Americans.

—A core of Lutherans are basically favorable toward church colleges, while a larger group, perhaps a majority of Lutherans, are favorable toward church colleges, but are so for reasons other than really knowing and understanding the colleges. This group tends to transfer loyalty to the church, on to church colleges, and other church institutions.

Dr. Fintel is Executive Director of the Division of College Education of the American Lutheran Church. *His address was the fourth annual Lina R. Meyer Lecture.*

—Those Lutherans who are most favorable toward church colleges tend to be younger, better educated, more open to change and stronger in a pattern of personal piety.

—There is a Lutheran Ethos which is characteristic of large numbers of Lutherans and which can be measured and interpreted.

—Though a majority of Lutherans hold to something called a "Lutheran Ethic", there is a wide diversity of beliefs, attitudies, and life styles among Lutherans.

—Clergy tend to be more supportive of church colleges than are laity.

Certain findings came as surprises in that there were negligible or no differences on characteristics we might have assumed would be important.

—Theological position (from fundamentalist to liberal) had no appreciable impact on attitudes toward church colleges.

—Church body membership had almost no relationship to attitudes toward church colleges.

—Outside of level of education, socio-economic indicators showed no significant relationships to attitudes toward church colleges.

A Personal Note

These findings are, of course, utterly objective, but in order that you may better understand my objectivity let me tell you where I come from. Outside of the army, farming and brief forays into the laboring world, my entire career has been with the church or church colleges.

My work in church colleges began the day I was graduated from Wartburg College in 1951. The college anticipated a decline in enrollment in the fall, so they released two staff members and hired me as director of public relations, admissions, alumni, sports information and assorted odd jobs such as being on nine committees. I did not realize that we were supposed to go down in enrollment, so I drove 30,000 miles recruiting students in June, July, and August, and we ended up with two more students than a year earlier. I didn't know much about PR, alumni, and fund raising either, but I developed through field work an appreciation for the views of the people, and of the importance of personal contacts — a finding I violate much too much now at the National level.

Many of the problems our college faced had to do with constituents who didn't know, or didn't understand **who** we were, and **what** we were trying to do. For some reason I figured out that this had something to do with communication. I was laboring, at the time, under the idea that good communications meant more and better news stories, publications and speeches. Perhaps in stable times that is true. At any rate I followed up that idea with a year at the University of Wisconsin in journalism, public relations and education.

The following year was the year of merger for the ALC so that my contacts with Sidney Rand, and his need for someone experienced in communications work led to my coming to the national offices. These years in Minneapolis are too recent for me to see in clear perspective, but I have a feeling that my relative naivete, v.v. traditions and prior commitments, helped me to cope with the changes which have descended on us in the '60's and now continue into the '70's.

The Study Idea

In Minneapolis I kept asking questions about the constituency because we were not getting the necessary financial support for either church or colleges. The thought persisted that if we knew more about the constituency it would be easier to communicate our programs and our needs. So several years ago, in anticipation of what might be facing us, I embarked on a study of how church members felt about church colleges. At first the attempts were small, and these have been reported in ALC circles and elsewhere. About that same time I was invited to serve on the steering committee of **A Study of Generations of Lutherans**[1] funded by Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Society. That assignment coincided with my Ph.D. program interests at Minnesota, and enabled me to develop a dissertation topic which utilized **A Study of Generations** data. Not all my questions could be included in this large study, but some of the basic ones were, and these were related to trying to discover and understand the church member and his or her attitudes toward church colleges — based on an old theory that **the people ultimately decide.**

As I indicated, we were already working on a separate study of ALC constituency attitudes in connection with the development of a position paper on higher education. That study was not scientifically designed, but in retrospect the findings gave us some first clues that the constituency was moving beyond where I thought they were — and I suspect also beyond where the majority of college

faculty and officials thought they were. We were still **re-**acting to the frozen conservatives, and not **pro-**acting with an important and stronger element of the constituency (I'll call them thawed out conservatives) who sensed the need for freedom, movement, and an open system. The responses to one question will perhaps illustrate my point. We asked, "Who should govern the campus?" The five possible choices ranged from a) "the board of regents for the constituency", to e) "a campus council constituted as a board so that all decisions cay be made on campus. The majority of respondents selected the "d" response which was, "Faculty, students and board joining in a campus council with legal questions left to the board."

This question was asked in 1970 when one might have expected some kind of crackdown, as it is I **now** associate that response with a sort of populist disenchantment with the "establishment", and with a not-always-sublimated longing of people to be able to participate in the affairs and decisions influencing their lives. But I also take it as general supportiveness for the campuses, a thought you might tuck away for later use.

A Three-decker Sandwich

With this kind of background let me now turn to three slabs of research findings which I feel are highly related and relevant to people like ourselves who are charged with responsibilities in Lutheran higher education.

The first slab describes the constituency and attitudes toward Lutheran colleges, and attempts to differentiate persons on the basis of their attitudes and certain characteristics.

The second examines the characteristics of two contrasting groups of Lutherans, those highly critical of the church, and those who are highly supportive of the church.

The third takes a look at some world views of Lutherans and attempts to relate these views to church college attitudes.

Slab One: Profile and Analysis

The first of these slabs is based on my dissertation[2]. My purpose was to differentiate groups of ALC members on the basis of their attitudes toward church colleges and to identify some of the variables related to these differences. A secondary purpose was to develop a profile of confirmed members of the ALC (ages 15-65) as a further aid to making administrative and policy decisions relating

to higher education and the church. The development of a baseline for future research was another imperative.

The data came from **A Study of Generations** data bank. Last year in Washington, I reported some preliminary results to this annual conference. I shall not spend much time with the detailed results here since the thesis is available either from University microfilms, or from my office where we have several "lending" copies.

In the beginning I planned to extend the study to include data from both the LCA and LC-MS. To make the thesis managable I concentrated first on the ALC. Then this fall we subjected the data from **all three** synods to an identical discriminant analysis program. The results of this analysis, plus the examination of some descriptive data, convinced me that painstaking, comparative analysis was not the most productive use of my time. The differences were so small, or meaningless on most variables, that a decision was made to report to you primarily on the basis of the ALC study and to incorporate LCA or LC-MS data only when there was a significant or interesting departure for one or both.

Profile. The profile portion of my study tells us little that is new. In the typical ALC congregation (and with minor adjustments up or down for the LCA and LC-MS as well) six of ten confirmed members are women, 35 per cent (nearly double the national average) of the members will have had some college. In the 15 to 29 age group more men will have had some college, while in the 50 to 65 group the college educated women outnumber the men.

Sociologically many of these members had rural or very small town origins, found employment as white collar workers, considered themselves middle to upper-middle class, and had incomes to match. ALC members (43%) were more rural in origin than either LC-MS (37%) or LCA (33%). On most measures, as was the case in **A Study of Generations,** the ALC held down the middle position between LCA and LC-MS.

More Lutherans indicated a Republican rather than a Democratic preference, with clergy somewhat more Republican (ALC 61% vs. 41%). Clergy tended to have lower incomes than the laity and were predominantly products of church colleges. In all three synods clergy tended to choose moderate responses on a fundamentalist-conservative-neoorthodox to liberal theological position continuum more so than did the laity. But even for the laity close to 50 per

cent chose the conservative response. Considerably more LC-MS members chose the "fundamentalist" response (21% to 11%) than did ALC and LCA members. Despite these variations it is noteworthy that my later analysis does not connect theological position to attitudes toward church colleges. Theological differences do seem to be related to age, sex and education with the younger, college educated males most liberal and the older, less well educated females tending to be more conservative.

In the dissertation I used the responses to four questions to determine which Lutherans were most favorable toward church colleges. The four questions were:

Item 682 Congregations should continue to support their liberal arts colleges. (Agree, disagree, "?")

Item 686 In view of the increasing costs, our Lutheran churches as synods and denominations should seriously consider abandoning their social service work to competent private and public agencies. (Agree, disagree, "?")

Item 703 With the increasing costs of higher education and the competition for qualified faculty, we Lutherans should seriously consider abandoning many of our private colleges. (Agree, disagree, "?")

Item 502 The amount of financial support given by the church to its colleges is a) less than ought to be given b) about right c) more than d) none should be given.

I shall not give you detailed response to the individual items at this time. The printed paper will include tables (see Exhibit 1) of lay responses by synod and the combined responses of all clergy. No matter which way you cut this one, it comes out that from two-thirds to three-fourths of Lutherans ages 15 to 65 responded to these four questions in ways that suggest strong support for church colleges, moreover, clergymen are generally more favorable then laymen. Among responding clergy of the three synods there was a pattern of response with ALC clergy generally the most favorable and LCA clergy least so.

Analysis. The analytic portion of my study was based on a classification of respondents into groups that were judged as favorable, neutral, or unfavorable toward church colleges. A system[3] of scoring the lay responses to the four items referred to above was devised and we were able to classify three groups as follows:

TABLE 1

Lutherans Classified as Favorable, Neutral, or Unfavorable Toward Church Colleges

Group	Synod LCA	ALC	LC-MS	Total
	N=1238	N=1031	N=1217	N=3486
	%	%	%	%
Favorable	17.7	16.9	19.2	18.0
Neutral	65.4	66.0	63.6	65.0
Unfavorable	16.9	17.1	17.2	17.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Some arbitrary system of classification of subjects is essential to the use of the discriminant analysis program employed in this study. The program analyzes subject responses to a large number of independent variables by group, and tests for significant differences. The intent is to discover, 1) if church members classified as favorable differed significantly from those classified as either neutral or unfavorable, and 2) to determine which characteristics or responses best differentiated the groups. In other words, can church members be classified by attitudes toward church colleges and which variables contribute to the classification?

The analysis established clear differences between the three a priori groupings for each of the three synods as well as for the combined synods. The data show that for the combined synods four characteristics were discerned as contributing significantly to the discovered differences between groups. They were, in order of contribution: Education level, personal piety, openness to change, and age level. Virtually identical results were obtained for ALC members only.

When analyzed individually the LCA and LC-MS results were slightly different. In both cases education level, piety and change orientation were indicated as critical variables, but neither synod showed differences due to age level. Apparently age level contributed to ALC attitudes toward church colleges in some systematic way, but did not do so for LCA or LC-MS. No other variables, including theological position, contributed to the differences discovered.

It would appear that for Lutherans generally those who are most supportive of church colleges tend to have a strong pattern of personal piety **(Study of Generations,** Scale 41, a measure denoting

active church membership and devotional life[4]), are college educated, and are oriented toward accepting social change. (Scale 37, Need for Unchanging Structure[5]). For the ALC alone the most supportive members are also younger than those in either the neutral or unfavorable groups.

Another interesting result of the discriminant analysis program is that it provides for a posterior classification of Lutherans into the three previously described groups, using the responses to each of the variables as a means of identifying the logical groupings. Whereas my original classification produced 18 per cent favorable, 17 per cent unfavorable and 65 per cent neutral, the posterior classification of all Lutherans taking the pattern of responses to all items into account was 38 per cent favorable, 44 per cent unfavorable, and 18 per cent neutral.

TABLE 2

Posterior Classification of Lutherans by Attitudes Toward Church Colleges

Old Classification	New Classification			Total N and % of old groups	
	Favorable	Neutral	Unfavorable		
				N	%
Favorable	802	427	1036	2265	65.0
Neutral	371	105	151	627	18.0
Unfavorable	148	197	349	594	17.0
Total N of new groups	1321	629	1536	3486	
Total % of new groups	38.0	18.0	44.0		100.0

The new groupings are difficult to interpret because no prior measure of support level exists to suggest whether these new group percentages make any sense, are good or bad, or up or down from some previous circumstance. In view of annual alumni drives which normally evoke a behavioral response from fewer than 20 per cent of the alumni who might expected to be favorable — the 38 per cent level we found may be about right for an attitudinal response.

Slab Two: Lovers and Critics

This second slab of research data, as is true of the one to follow, comes primarily from data gathered for **A Study of Generations,** it focuses on persons typical of two polar groups — those

most critical and those most loyal to the church. To achieve this focus a measure of criticism or "Disappointment with the Church" (Scale 27)[6] was combined with a measure expressing support and affirmation of the church and its institutions (Scale 26)[7], thus separating out those who might be labeled "Unloving Critics" and those who could be considered "Uncritical Lovers", after the terminology of John Gardner.[8] Both groups represent small, or minority positions, but need to be recognized as part of our broader constituency.

The combination of these measures was an attempt to enlarge our perspective and ask whether favorable attitudes toward church colleges related to support or criticism of the church in general. One reason for this added analysis is that neither my dissertation nor the **Study of Generations** identified a network of clear-cut views toward church colleges, or other church-related institutions — only responses to separate items which were helpful but not really definitive. Neither did the study identify a clearly defined set of images of the mission of the church today.

It seems important to ask what typifies those who are most critical or uncritical of the church in general because we find that there is a tendency for many critics of the church to be critical of all its structure and programs — including church colleges. They are turned off by **the whole thing.**

Conversely, persons closely identified with the church and finding high personal satisfaction with its rituals and other activities, tend to be blindly loyal and feel the church is best at almost anything and everything.

Fortunately a majority of **Study of Generations** respondents expressed more moderate favorable sentiments regarding the church and tempered their complaints and criticisms. A few key items and the response to them are cited to reflect the general response patterns.

Item 687 "Either the Church as a whole doesn't know what is really going on, or it doesn't have answers for today's problems."
About one-third of **all** Lutherans agreed with this statement; 85% of the most critical group endorsed this statement compared with only 1% of those most satisfied with the church.

Item 697 "What the Lutheran Church teaches has little to say about life as it really is."

Only 15% of all Lutherans agreed to this statement and **none** of those most satisfied. By contrast, 73%, about three out of four in the most critical group, feels the Lutheran Church is "out of it".

Of more than academic interest to this audience is the fact that persons who agreed to the above items also tended to agree to such items as:

Item 703 "With the increasing costs of higher education and the competition for qualified faculty, we Lutherans should seriously consider abandoning many of our private colleges."

About one fourth agreed or were in doubt about this. 55% of the most critical and none of the most supportive.

Other statements were worded to reflect positive church evaluations, such as:

Item 688 "As far as the real questions that I wrestle with are concerned, the Church generally provides answers that are helpful."

Here again about three out of four Lutherans agreed with this statement, and one fourth disagreed or had some doubts. Only 20% of the most critical accepted this statement, compared with **all** of those most loyal and satisfied.

Persons who accepted the above statement were also most likely to accept statements giving flattering appraisals of what good the church does as an institution and through its various agencies. Church colleges and welfare agencies, for example, do a better job than their secular counterparts; they enjoy giving money to both their congregation and the church at large; they see the church as a necessary institution to "establish and preserve concepts of right and wrong in society". They see it as relevant and norm-setting, which partly accounts for their strong endorsement of this statement:

Item 679 "A person who does not believe in God should not be permitted to teach in a church-related college." About two out of three Lutherans accepted this statement; 94% of those most loyal, compared with 39% of those most critical.

Although both the "unloving critics" and "uncritical lovers" represented minority positions (perhaps each less than 10%), we need to know what best describes the person who holds one or the other view.

For the unloving critic:

—criticism is most charactistic of youth, especially single male college youth.

—critics are more apt to express little interest in religion, to be less certain of their faith, and to have a lower rate of involvement in both public worship and personal piety.

—they feel more left out of church activity, alienated from other generations, least inclined to support the church financially.

—they are most eager for congregations and pastors to get involved in social action, political and social controversy.

For the "uncritical lover":

—they are older, less well educated.

—they have a stronger faith commitment and level of personal piety.

—they are stronger in financial commitment.

—they desire that the church maintain present rituals, and not get embroiled in social activism.

One can speculate whether the attitudes of either extreme extend to various church-related structures, particularly the church college. Is the college seen as an instrument of the church? Or a critic? Or both? If the worship and ethos of the college is closely tied to the church ethos, will there be a difference in attitudes of church members? Do church members understand the church college as an expression of mission?

Obviously we do not know, but the questions suggest to me that we ought to give much thought to some continuing research on constituency attitudes.

Slab Three: Law and Gospel

The third slab reveals some of the Law/Gospel dimensions of Lutheran beliefs as uncovered by, **A Study of Generations.** In the initial volume of that study, Chapters 5 and 6 reported that the first two factors which emerged were the "beliefs" and the "misbeliefs"

of Lutherans. These factors have also been labeled as Gospel and Law respectively. The authors, particularly Arthur Johnson, have been delving into the makeup and meaning of these two factors. I have borrowed heavily from Johnson for this portion of the paper because I am convinced that the beliefs and misbeliefs of Lutherans have implications for the work and mission of the church college.

Johnson developed a typology of Lutherans based on a cross comparison of responses to the two leading dimensions on the Law/Gospel factors. One of these was Scale 28 (Transcendental Meaning in Life)[9] which we shall give the shorthand name of Gospel; the other was Scale 37 (Need for Unchanging Structures)[10] which we shall call Law. I must enter a caveat here both for Johnson and myself. Johnson prefers not to use the Law/Gospel labels because of their loaded meaning for many people. I have used them to ease the problem of presenting the data. Reducing the scores to quartiles and making a joint quartile distribution for these two dimensions and then limiting our discussion only to the extreme corners of the distribution we come up with the following distribution. (See Exhibit 2 for complete Joint Quartile Distribution).

TABLE 3

		Gospel	
		High	Low
L a w	Low	222	395
	High	305	211

The descriptors for these four groups are fascinating to me, for example, a person in the group high on Gospel but low on Law, looks for all the world like the ideal church college graduate — in fact our catalog statements sometimes describe him well. As you listen to the various descriptors you will hear similarities with the Slab Two Data I reported earlier on "unloving critics" and "uncritical lovers."

High Gospel, Low Law (upper left quadrant)

The person who tends to score high on Gospel and low on Law has these characteristics, all of which are statistically significant when contrasted to other corners.

He is most like the clergy; is high on all measures of basic religious beliefs; most likely to accept both the humanity and divinity of Jesus; most knowledgeable of the Bible; most likely to

accept the exclusive truth claim of salvation through Christ, but reject the exclusive channel of the church. He rejects salvation by works; is least alienated; less prejudiced; more willing to forgive others; to face both life and death; to meet the world as it is, rather than to try to escape. He is open and optimistic without being pollyannish; is an active church member, but is not trapped in a work ethic; knows the church is not perfect; is unlikely to want the church to be primarily a reform agency or the pastor to be heavily activitist. He is typically the core member of a congregation, active, faithful, receptive to change, and has a life style centered around salvation through Christ.

Persons with this orientation are heavily represented among Lutheran clergy, and among better educated laymen who are personally involved in church activity. They constitute the bulwark of the organized leadership in most congregations and hence constitute a key group for church college leaders to understand and relate to. They are estimated to comprise between 15-25 per cent of the average congregation.

Because they tend to center their lives around their religious values, they tend to have the same expectation for leaders of structures having a close church affiliation such as church colleges. They do not expect perfection, but they do expect some distinctive evidence of a religious commitment.

High Law, Low Gospel

In sharp contrast stand those who are most resistant to change and have a secular orientation. These tend to be the Archie Bunkers. Religion is supposed to be personally useful, to solve personal problems and club personal enemies. This group scores highest on prejudice and stereotypes, and high on all measures of alienation (isolation, pessimism, meaninglessness, powerlessness, and strong peer orientation). They tend to vacillate between wanting a world they can control and dominate and one which they can escape. They are most ignorant of the Bible, most prone to believe in salvation by works, and are most self-oriented. They are marginal in their church support and activity, and on the other hand most critical of the church and seem oblivious to the challenge to serve others. Their reform interest is in restoring the past or preserving the status quo. They lack a confident faith.

This group would view the college scene from quite a different perspective, generally a threatened one. They would see the shenanigans on college campuses as threatening the basic serenity they

value in a stable society with clear cut distinctions between right and wrong, good guys and bad guys, we and they. They are unable to identify with campus diversity in a practical way. Thus publicity of deviancy and radicalism, would tend to reinforce their stereotypes of college students and faculty as "meatheads". Persons leaning toward this orientation are least prevalent of the four types here depicted, totalling perhaps 10 to 20% of Lutherans.

Johnson points out that the other two corners of this typology, what might be termed a low law, low Gospel group and a high Law, high Gospel group are larger in number and tend to blend together.

Low Gospel, Low Law

The low Gospel, low Law group includes the secular, change oriented type. He is low on all measures of beliefs. He tends to accept the humanity of Jesus and reject his divinity. Curiously, he is apt to have a transcendent, remote conception of God rather than an immanent one. He is least likely to accept tradition or ritual; is most anxious about his faith, and is low in church participation and personal piety. While not favorable to the church he wants the pastor and the church to plunge into social controversy and reform. He rejects middle class values, engages in questionable personal activities, and finds his life meaningless. He is least able to face life and death and is most prone to seek escape through drugs. He is least prejudiced but tends to be intolerant of the establishment and would use power to change it. He is most apt to be a college age male.

This group tends to be liberal both theologically and socially; finds many eager supporters of change and innovation in institutions and would see the church college as an arena for experimentation and reform. Such views would typify about 15-25% of Lutherans, with perhaps 50% or more of the students and faculty at some Lutheran colleges in this group and considerably fewer at other colleges.

Because persons in this group tend to be the most vocal and visible segments of campus political leadership, they tend to provide the model of the student body to outsiders — if not also to campus administrations. Actually, college age youth show considerable diversity, if not volatility, in their belief and value commitments, attitudinal orientations and life styles.

High Gospel, High Law

The fourth group is characterized by those who accept the Gospel but struggle under the heavy load of the law. People of

this type exhibit high Gospel dimensions but negate it by adding misbeliefs. This group tends to be older and less well educated, to be fundamentalistic and experience centered. They accept the divinity of Jesus but reject his humanity. They exaggerate exclusive truth claims, but feel that church institutions do a better job than secular institutions. They are utopian and apt to be neighborly, but do not consider other races among their network of friends. They are active in church, sure of their faith, support middle class norms, prefer a dependable world, a strong work ethic, and are generally conservative.

Persons holding to traditional or conservative patterns of beliefs and attitudes regarding both the church and other basic institutions are rather numerous in Lutheran congregations, comprising about 35-45% of total membership.

They see the church and church-related institutions primarily as preservers, interpreters and carriers of the traditional faith as they understand it. The primary role of the church college is to transmit the heritage, prepare persons for church vocations, conserve the faith and personal piety of Lutheran youth. Academic, vocational and service goals are apt to have secondary consideration.

As we conclude this report it seems necessary to say that a survey such as reported here can only provide us with a portrait taken in the summer of turbulent 1970. It cannot tell us what the Lutheran campus or church scene was like in 1960, or will be like in 1980. Only further surveys, gathered over time, can provide us with reasonably and valid trend data.

Flash Back

These are the slices of our three decker. I hesitated a while before serving the whole thing, but I decided to risk your indigestion.

I was also tempted to draw all kinds of conclusions and implications from the data. I have succumbed only partly. I shall point to several implications and ask some questions, but leave it to each of you to make the connections to the real world you face.

One of the major implications has to do with Lutheran Unity. I am not espousing organic merger — but I am suggesting that the data call attention more to **our alikeness** than to **our uniqueness** as members of synods. Both in theology and attitudes there seems to be little to keep Lutheran colleges from cooperation and coordination, or to keep us from uniting to face the common challenges of

the future. The church expects and deserves that kind of leadership from its colleges.

The unity I see centers around the idea that commitment to Lutheranism is really commitment to a belief system or world view, not to ethnicity or narrow parochialism. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the magnetic center.

The ramifications for us in church colleges include another reexamination of institutional role and purpose. The commonality of church and college lies not in context, but in content.

We must not in such reexamination lose sight of either the diversity of Lutheran world views, or the need for diversely unique Lutheran colleges.

A second implication is that Lutheran Church colleges have a unique challenge to lead out. The 20th century has been one which has been searching for values, whether from Sartre, Camus or more recent thinkers, the intellectual ferment has revolved around meaning and purpose. The Lutheran Ethos is an intellectual ethos and Lutheran colleges ought to be much at home in this arena. I believe our people are waiting for voices of leadership and wisdom.

Thirdly, I have a question as to what extent the church college is obligated to return graduates to congregations prepared to work with and help these congregations meet new and emerging needs? What responsibility is there for graduates to share their growth and development "back home" in such a way as to help congregations to identify with the church college. I am not asking for programmed response, but whether it is possible to develop an ethos which says that learning and service go together. The answer is that they do go together, but we need to make more of a conscious effort to provide the rationale and opportunities for both.

Fourth, I have another question. Can we as colleges extend the effectiveness of what has been done by **A Study of Generations** by pursuing further study of the attitudes, beliefs, values and life styles, not only of Lutherans but of all our students. We need to know more about how students change. The instrumentation for longitudinal studies is available with a minimum of adaptation. With modifications we can easily study our alumni or other constituents as well.

Finally, I have a plea rather than a question or implication. I enter it with you the leadership in Lutheran higher education. I enter it because I have watched for just two short years what powerful

leadership in the person of Kent Knutson could do to enliven and rededicate a whole church. It is one of God's ironies that this man who breathed new life into the church and created so much excitement and hope, now lies on his death bed.

My plea is that each of you take on a larger mantle of leadership than your college only. If our colleges and our church are to play helpful and productive roles in the future we must somehow lead into the future.

What we need is a new and powerful theological rationale for the church college entering a new age — an age Bob Theobald has called the communication era. Our time stands in stark contrast to the not so old industrial era, with its product-oriented-bureaucracy. Ours is an era which is increasingly **people, not product** oriented, which needs communication for meaningful survival, which lives more by values than by capital; which finds authority in competency not structure or hierarchy. These are the changes which most disturb "Law" oriented people; which cause others to call for reform and revolution; which I think also make for the only viable world view, one which is deeply rooted in Jesus Christ whose grace frees us to live with change as a natural part of God's order, free to be, free to live, but bound to serve— **all** of God's people.

EXHIBIT I: RESPONSES TO COLLEGE ATTITUDE ITEMS

TABLE E: 1

Attitudes of Lutherans Toward Congregational Support of Liberal Arts Colleges

Question: "Congregations should continue to support their liberal arts colleges."

Response	Synod			
	LCA N=1238 %	ALC N=1031 %	LC-MS N=1217 %	All Clergy N=282 %
Agree	75.9	72.2	68.6	90.1
Disagree or ?	24.1	27.8	31.4	9.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE E: 2

Attitudes of ALC Members Toward Abandoning Church Colleges

Question: "With the increasing costs of higher education and the competition for qualified faculty, we Lutherans should seriously consider abandoning many of our private colleges."

Response	Synod			
	LCA N=1238 %	ALC N=1031 %	LC-MS N=1217 %	All Clergy N=282 %
Disagree	73.0	76.1	78.1	70.9
Agree or ?	27.0	23.9	21.9	29.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE E: 3

Attitudes of ALC Members Toward Abandoning Social Service Work

Question: "In view of increasing costs, our Lutheran churches as synods and denominations should seriously consider abandoning their social service work to competent private and public institutions."

Response	Synod			
	LCA N=1238 %	ALC N=1031 %	LC-MS N=1217 %	All Clergy N=282 %
Disagree	69.1	73.3	71.0	83.7
Agree or ?	30.9	26.7	29.0	16.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE E: 4

Attitudes of ALC Members Toward Church Support of Church Colleges

Question: "The amount of financial support given by the church to its colleges is:
a) less than ought to be given
b) about right
c) more than ought to be given
d) no financial support if justified"

Response	Synod			
	LCA N=1238 %	ALC N=1031 %	LC-MS N=1217 %	All Clergy N=282 %
a)	28.4	27.2	36.2	55.7
b)	58.9	64.4	54.5	32.3
c) & d)	12.7	8.4	9.3	12.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

EXHIBIT II: LUTHERAN WORLD VIEWS

TABLE E: 5

Joint Quartile Distribution of Lutherans on Measures of Transcendental Meaning in Life and Need for Unchanging Structures

			Gospel			
			High		Low	
			Q^4	Q^3	Q^2	Q^1
Law	Low	Q^1	222	216	278	395
		Q^2	249	236	325	251
	High	Q^3	330	270	315	233
		Q^4	305	288	320	211

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Strommen, Merton P.; Brekke, Milo L.; Underwager, Ralph; and Johnson, Arthur L. **A Study of Generations.** Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.
2. Fintel, Norman D. **The Attitudes of Lutherans Toward Church Colleges.** Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Ph.D., 1972.
3. **Ibid.,** Chapter VI
4. Strommen, **op. cit.,** p. 376
5. **Ibid.,** p. 375
6. **Ibid.,** p. 373
7. **Ibid.,** p. 372
8. Gardner, John W., "Unloving Critics and Uncritical Lovers", Cornell University Commencement Address, June 1968.
9. Strommen, **op. cit.,** p. 373
10. **Ibid.,** p. 375

"THE CHURCH, THE STUDENT, AND THE FUTURE"

59th Annual Convention

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, California

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1973

President's Suite

2:30 p.m. Board of Directors Meeting

West Lounge

4:00-6:30 p.m. Registration

California Room

6:30 p.m. Banquet
"The Changing Attitudes of College Students and Implications for Church Related Colleges"
Dr. Paul Heist, Chairman, Division of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1973

Imperial Ballroom

8:30 a.m. Devotions
Dr. Raymond M. Bost, President
Lenoir Rhyne College

8:45 a.m. President's Report
Dr. A. O. Davidson, President
Wagner College

9:00 a.m. Report of Commission on the Future:
Dr. A. G. Huegli, Commission Chairman and President of Valparaiso University

10:00 a.m. Coffee Break

10:15 a.m. 4th Annual Lina R. Meyer Lecture
"Attitudes of Lutherans Toward
Church-Related Colleges"
Dr. Norman Fintel, Executive
Director, Board of College Education,
American Lutheran Church

11:00 a.m. Discussion of Fintel Presentation

11:45 a.m. Announcements

Anza Room

12:15 p.m. Luncheon
"Religious Behavior and American Society"
Dr. Charles Glock, Department of Sociology,
University of California, Berkeley, California

Imperial Ballroom

2:15 p.m. Washington Report
Mr. Howard Holcomb
Executive Associate,
Association of American Colleges

3:00 p.m. Coffee Break

3:15 p.m. Business Meeting
Secretary-Treasurer's Report
Election of Officers and Directors

4:30 p.m. Adjournment

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(Editor's note: In that two of the major presentations of this year's annual meeting were developed from preliminary findings of larger research projects, and will appear, when completed, in other publications, the addresses of Dr. Paul Heist and Dr. Charles Glock will not be presented in full here. Keeping in mind the inadequacy of a summary of a prepared presentation, it is still hoped that what follows will give the reader a glimpse of the work these scholars presented to those attending the meetings. An outline of the Washington Report of Mr. Howard Holcomb is also included with the realization that the details of the presentation, because of their relevance to the current political situation, have greatest significance at the time given. Yet at least a listing of the topics considered will be of historical value in indicating the concerns of the Conference at this particular meeting.)

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Banquet Address: Dr. Paul Heist, Chairman, Division of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

"The Changing Attitudes of College Students and Implications for Church Related Colleges."

Dr. Heist developed his topic by presenting essentially a case study of one of the LECNA schools, Luther, of Decorah, Iowa. Luther was one of six colleges and universities in the U. S. which participated in a four year study project arranged by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley under Dr. Heist's direction. The project was not an institutional study, but a study of the variety of students on a selection of somewhat dissimilar campuses and the changes that took place with these students between the time they entered college in 1966 and their graduation in 1970. The other schools involved were the University of California located at Berkeley and Santa Cruz, the College of the Pacific and Raymond College at Stockton, California, and Macalaster College in St. Paul, Minnesota.

While Dr. Heist recognized that the Lutheran colleges differ among themselves, he felt that in many ways the characteristics studied could be considered typical of many of the Lutheran schools similar to Luther. And therefore, the study would have relevance to other LECNA members. Results observed in the research include the following:

—Compared with other schools, Luther had a significantly larger sample of students increasing the level of their intellectual disposition and interest in learning.

—Luther had a greater number of students who made both large and medium shifts in their general personality orientation.

—There was a greater degree of satisfaction with the college and their education than other groups studied.

—Luther graduates were unique in continuing a high religious activity involvement. Dr. Heist pointed out that while there was no measurement of intensification, there certainly could be no conclusion that four years at Luther jeopardized the religious interests or beliefs of the students.

—Luther was one of two schools with the largest proportion of students switching to a liberal political position by their senior year.

—There was a change on the Luther campus, as on the others, in a number of views held on personal ethical issues, although Luther was the one school where these issues were still a matter of considerable serious debate and concern.

In drawing conclusions from the study, Dr. Heist stated that the results portray the positive accomplishment of the modern day Christian college. "This accomplishment took place in the troubled time of the late '60's and with a collection of students whose entering characteristics did not really predicate the changes observed four years later." These results, he added, cause one to wonder how far they can be generalized for students at Luther in other times, or for students on other denominational campuses during this or other periods.

When one looks for an explanation to what was observed, the easy answer would be to say that the time was ripe for many changes because of the general discouragement with the Vietnam war, alienation of youth, the changing role of religion, protests of minorities, changing roles of institutional authority, etc. With these social forces plus the facility of television and stereophonic media, one could expect young people to be influenced and changed.

But these forces and influences were being experienced by students in all colleges and doesn't explain the particular changes at Luther even if one admits that some of the change was external to the campus in the larger social environment. Moreover this ex-

ternal factor was very likely less on the Luther campus because of the lack of many social deviants, political activists or general provocateurs.

The logical explanation for the changes in learning would be faculty and curriculum. Included in the positive contributors identified are "a goodly number of human beings, persons with care, concern and intellect, serving in the role of leaders, administrators and teachers." A pertinent and effective curriculum mediated by an interested faculty can provide appropriate learning experiences for particular students at hand, especially if the curricular experiences are "addressed to their needs and their intended futures, and assist them to new orientations and attitudes that permit them to live more perceptively and meaningfully" in their family settings and chosen occupations.

"The majority of Luther graduates of 1970 presented a seemingly healthy balance of academic interests, religious beliefs and practices, humanitarian concerns, and a social sophistication adequate to the contemporary world. Whatever the true or total story of their college years, it proved to be to the advantage of the majority." For this school, what happened can be interpreted as mostly a success story.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Luncheon Address: Dr. Charles Glock, Sociologist, University of California, Berkeley.

"Religious Behavior and American Society"

Dr. Charles Glock presented an interim report of research he and student and faculty colleagues are pursuing as to the ways in which people perceive the world around them. This involves an investigation of religious and other kinds of consciousness which prevail in America today. The task, as described by Dr. Glock, includes:

1) Trying to understand the nature of consciousness;
2) Sensing the relative attractiveness of different forms of consciousness; and
3) Especially thinking through what may be implied for the future of social life and the future of American social institutions by changes which we may be able to discern in the kinds of ways people understand their world.

While the data so far is preliminary and no firm or systematized set of conclusions can be stated, a general governing thesis

has emerged, namely that we are now in a watershed period which involves more than a modification of the past, but rather a major break with the past in terms of consciousness.

While the investigation has considered how one is conscious of what is around him on three levels: how people think, feel, and believe, major emphasis so far has been on the cognitive — how do people conceive of their lives and the world around them and what processes do they employ to structure their reality.

There have been difficulties in the study. For one thing not much previous data has been available since books that touch the subject deal with well known people, the elite. The interest of the study is the average person. Moreover, the average person doesn't normally think about how he conceptualizes the world about him. This is a latent, rather than a manifest process. Also, people tend to operate with different kinds of understandings of the world. So the task of the study has been to perceive these different types of understandings, realizing that people are not easily categorized, and only approximate general types, rather than fit exactly. Nevertheless a tentative, four-tier typology has been developed in which the key element is the agent the individual sees to be in control of events that happen in the world.

1) **The Fated Mode** holds that a transcendent force controls the world. This force could be God, fate, astrology, luck, etc. The individual characterized by this type explains life in terms of this force which may act capriciously, demonically, beneficiently, etc.

2) **The Horatio Alger Mode** is one in which each man is primarily or exclusively in control of his destiny. God enters history only to create it, leaving man to be the primary force. Things are explained largely by whether or not people use their freedom well.

3) **The Scientific Mode** draws its inspiration from the natural and social sciences. It is deterministic and sees forces at work through heredity and environment. These are agents beyond man in somewhat similar fashion to the forces of the Fated Mode, but man can exercise control when he understands these forces.

4) **The New Consciousness Mode** is the most inchoate and difficult to describe. It transcends the first two, toys with the third but rejects the potentiality of science to provide an all-encompassing world view. This new way to perceive

and express reality often goes beyond science, especially in that science is not seen to address the value question of life.

These modes are of value in that, in addition to helping us understand how people conceptualize reality, they influence the views of people as to how one can change what one sees in the world. The first group feels most efforts for change are doomed to failure, because there is no control possible of the forces. The Alger Mode types feel that change is up to the individual and are relatively blind to the operation of social forces. Therefore they are unreceptive to government programs for change. People themselves can do what is necessary or possible if only they will.

Those characterized by the Scientific Mode are most critical of the world and its ambiguities and demonstrate the greatest impetus to change. But they can become elitist in imposing their views of what the world needs. The fourth group searches for ways to improve the relationships between people and ways for more sensitivity in the understandings of human nature.

Attachments among people in all of the modes to organized religion have been discovered, although those in groups one and two are most likely to be in the traditional churches. Those of the fourth group tend to be interested in religion, but not in the traditional sense of the churches. While there may be the least observable affinity between the third group and religion, it is also true that among other things religion has traditionally been the source by which man has come to decisions about the good and the bad, and here some kind of interaction between science and religion holds some potential.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Washington Report: Mr. Howard E. Holcomb, Executive Associate for Federal Relations, Association of American Colleges, and former Secretary-Treasurer of LECNA.

Mr. Holcomb, who through his office is also the Washington legislative staff director for the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, to which the majority of LECNA schools belong, explained the relationship of the NCICU state organizations and the national staff. He described how the thirty-four present state organizations are organized into thirteen regions in such a way that a net-alert can be initiated with feed-back arriving in Washington from members the same day. Mr. Holcomb emphasized the importance of legislative issues on both the state and national

level and pointed to the value of having the efforts on behalf of the schools on both levels coordinated. The state organizations and grass-roots involvement enhances the impact of the member schools on the national scene.

Twelve key issues of the national scene were pointed out as having special significance this year. Mr. Holcomb's list included:

1. Appropriations to fund higher education authorizations.
2. The role of the Committee on Full Funding in the appropriations process.
3. National Science Foundation programs for higher education.
4. Proposed tax reform legislation as it affects giving to institutions of higher education; and
   a. Proposals for a tax credit for student higher education costs
   b. Tax relief for joint activities of college consortia.
5. Minimum Wage.
6. Unemployment compensation.
7. Development of guidelines to implement the Higher Education Act of 1972.
   a. State planning commissions.
   b. State student incentive guidelines.
   c. Basic Opportunity Grant guidelines.
8. Uniform management of institutional trust funds.
9. National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.
10. Cranston amendment to provide payments to institutions based on the number of veterans.
11. Court issues, primarily those involving the constitutionality of institutional aid and state programs of student aid.
12. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Singled out for special concern this year was the deepening struggle between the Administration and the Congress on the issue of executive impoundment of funds Congressionally appropriated. Resolution to some satisfactory degree of this situation is obviously necessary before there can be assurance that the legislative intent of either authorizing or appropriations legislation is carried out.

Mr. Holcomb concluded with a discussion of the importance of cooperation in the area of legislative activity — information and questionnaire response from the schools to Washington staff; and common endeavor between Washington staff members involved in representing such organizations as AAC, LECNA, and others with an independent and/or church-related constituency.

THE ANNUAL REPORT
of the
SECRETARY-TREASURER
LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA

San Francisco Hilton Hotel, San Francisco, CA January 13, 1973

This report is the fifth annual report provided through staff services of the Division of Educational Services of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., and comes at the close of the first full year of service with the Conference of the present Secretary-Treasurer.

MEMBERSHIP

In terms of official status, there were no changes in membership during 1972. Three schools which have previously indicated interest in membership by paying dues failed to do so during the year, but these have not indicated a desire to cease membership. The Board of Parish Education (LC-MS) has decided not to continue membership in view of the primary emphasis of LECNA on college and university affairs. Membership invitation was again extended to the Lutheran theological seminaries. While declining formal affiliation, the seminary presidents did decide to hold their winter meeting in Berkeley, California, at the time of LECNA's annual meeting, so that the presidents who so desired could attend portions of the LECNA convention, especially the Saturday luncheon. Membership remains open to the seminaries; and as the LECNA constitution provides, one member-at-large of the Board of Directors continues to represent a Lutheran seminary.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The LECNA Board met briefly following the business meeting of LECNA last year in Washington and set March 29, in Chicago, as the time and place of the mid-year meeting. Primary work of this meeting included adoption of the 1972 budget, planning for the 59th annual meeting, and preliminary work to establish a Commission on the Future as directed by the 58th annual meeting.

BUDGET

The financial report for 1972 is attached to this report as Exhibit A. The report shows the budget adopted by the Board of

Directors at the March 29 meeting and the actual expenses and receipts for the year. It will be noted that even though certain expenses were less than last year, the net balance of the Conference continued to decline. This is true, as was noted last year, because dues have not been increased for several years, and also because of the expenses of the first two meetings of the Commission on the Future. The increase in dues projected for 1973 in addition to the hope that outside funding will be found for the Commission should correct the financial problem.

ENROLLMENT

Exhibit B attached to this report gives enrollment statistics for Lutheran colleges and universities as collected and summarized by Rev. Edward Rauff of the Lutheran Council/U.S.A. Office of Research, Statistics, and Archives. The figures again show a mixed pattern, some schools increasing while others decreased. No definite and general trend was noticed. Total full time undergraduates at four year institutions decreased 823 from 1971 to 51,280 (—1.57%), while total head count increased by 1,732 to 81,698 revealing an increase in part time, summer, and special students. Total enrollment at the junior colleges was 5,399 with 693 of these being part time students. This represents a decline of 52 students from 1971 (—.95%).

PRESIDENTS

Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod schools have experienced the greatest change in presidencies of the three church bodies during the year. Dr. Michael J. Stelmachowicz is to be installed Sunday, January 14, as president of St. John's College, replacing Dr. Reuben Beisel who retired. The Rev. Ray Martens has very recently accepted a call to become president of Concordia Lutheran College of Austin, Texas, replacing Dr. Paul G. Elbrecht who died just one year ago this week. There are presidential vacancies at Concordia Teachers College — River Forest and Concordia Senior College — Fort Wayne due to the resignation of Dr. Martin L. Koehneke to become Director of Fraternal Affairs of Aid Association for Lutherans, and Dr. Martin J. Neeb who though officially retired is serving as a special consultant to Board of Higher Education (LC-MS).

Also during the year Dr. Mark A. Mathews was named first acting president, and then president of California Lutheran College. The Rev. Karl F. Langrock was installed as president of Grand View College this past fall replacing Dr. Ernest D. Nielsen who retired after 20 years of service at Grand View.

ANNUAL MEETING

Washington, D. C., proved a popular annual meeting site again in 1972 as 58 individuals registered for the 58th Annual Meeting, held at the Statler Hilton Hotel. Thirty-four colleges and universities were represented. The program featured addresses by Representative Edith Green, Chairman of the Higher Education Subcommittee of the House of Representatives' Education and Labor Committee; Mr. Peter Muirhead, Executive Deputy Commissioner of the Office of Education; Father Robert Henle, president of Georgetown University; the Rev. Dr. Kent Knutson, president of the American Lutheran Church; and Mr. Joseph Kane, Associate Director, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities. Dr. Edgar Carlson, executive director of Minnesota Private College Council delivered the Lina R. Meyer lecture. The program also featured an afternoon session devoted entirely to discussion of possibilities of further cooperation in the area of Lutheran higher education and featured brief presentations by Dr. Frank Gamelin, Lina R. Meyer lecturer of 1971, the three Board secretaries of college (higher) education — Dr. Louis Almen, Dr. Arthur Ahlschwede, and Dr. Norman Fintel — and Dr. Elwin Farwell, president of Luther College.

Because the 1973 convention of the Association of American Colleges was scheduled for San Francisco with the travel distance involved precluding attendance for many presidents at both LECNA and AAC if LECNA were held in the East or Midwest, the Board decided to hold the 59th annual meeting once again in conjunction with the AAC. Advance registration indicates that 32 colleges and universities will be represented this year. In addition two boards of higher (college) education, two boards of theological education, officials from campus ministry, Association of Lutheran College Faculties, a number of Lutheran educators in non-Lutheran institutions, and local clergy and other special guests have indicated plans to attend.

COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE

Without doubt the LECNA activity of greatest importance in terms of time and resources expended as well as significance was the establishment by the Board upon resolution by the 58th Annual Meeting of the Commission on the Future. The greatest bulk of discussion at the March meeting of the Board involved plans and goals of the Commission. The Board, building on the model set out in Dr. Francis Gamelin's Lina Meyer lecture of 1971, established a Commission with three categories of membership, each with four representatives elected to serve three-year terms. These are college

presidents, church body representatives, and external members. The Board elected the members following nominations from college presidents for the external members, and board secretaries for the church representatives. Those named are:

Presidents:

Dr. Raymond M. Bost, Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, NC
Dr. Thomas H. Langevin, Capital University, Columbus, OH
Dr. Robert V. Schnabel, Concordia College, Bronxville, NY
Dr. Willis L. Wright, Alabama Lutheran Academy and College, Selma, AL

Church Body Representatives:

Mr. Robert B. Gronlund, University of Tampa, Tampa, FL
Dr. Albert G. Huegli, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, IN
Dr. Edward Lindell, University of Denver, Denver, CO
Dr. Arthur L. Olsen, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD

External Members:

Dr. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, Yale University, New Haven, CT
Dr. Paul Dressel, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
Dr. Paul G. Kauper, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Dr. Manning Pattillo, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY

The Commission was given the following priority topics as guidance by the Board for their preliminary work:

1. Study the church constitutency with a view to discovering opportunities for serving it more extensively, e.g. through continuing education.
2. Study the prospects for cooperation among Lutheran institutions with a view to determining what cooperation federation, and consolidation would be worth consideration. In this connection it will perhaps be necessary to study the relationships of Lutheran colleges to regional needs.
3. Study changing student attitudes, characteristics, and needs, and the needs of the society they will serve, with a view to recommending early adjustments in college programs.
4. Follow the economy, the stance of the government units and personnel, and the public climate with a view to providing an early warning system on significant trends in the world, dangers and opportunities for Lutheran colleges.
5. Study the strengths and problems of Lutheran colleges and universities as independent units of an international system,

with a view to recommending recurrently how to take advantage of strengths and how to solve problems.

6. Study the goals of Lutheran colleges and whether they are achieved in the lives of students, and the values of the colleges as they may be inferred from college activities, expenditures, recruitment practices, and other behavior.
7. Study alternative plans for governmental subsidies to students and colleges, and the positions and efforts of other higher education agencies, with a view to recommending appropriate public policy and legislation.

Two meetings have been held. The first one, October 26 in Chicago, in addition to holding preliminary discussion on the priority topics elected as chairman, Dr. A. G. Huegli; vice-chairman, Dr. Raymond Bost; and secretary, R. L. Anderson. The second meeting, also held in Chicago, on December 17-18, featured further exploration of the priority topics by four sub-committees. Evidence of interest in their work on the part of Commission members was the fact that every member was present at what was admittedly a busy weekend of the year, just prior to Christmas. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for late March.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Other projects in the area of Lutheran college education were accomplished primarily through the Washington Office in conjunction with the common staff and program of the Division of Educational Services of the Lutheran Council/U.S.A. The Secretary-Treasurer once again served as coordinator of Lutheran College Days. Seven of these events were held this year with approximately 200,000 pieces of literature being sent to over 2,200 congregations and more than 1,000 high schools. The Secretary-Treasurer continues to coordinate Lutheran higher education activities by meeting with Lutheran deans, serving on the executive committee of the Association of Lutheran College Faculties, and by attending other meetings involving Lutheran college officials. The Division newsletter, **DEScription,** reaches wider circulation each month as additional individuals request to be placed on the mailing list. Requests for special assistance in Washington and for government information continue to be numerous. The Secretary-Treasurer tries to focus the work of the office on representation of Lutheran interests with legislative and administrative personnel as well as with non-Lutheran educational organizations and groups.

The Lutheran Council/U.S.A. is experiencing formal structural organization. Some of these changes will affect the Division of Educational Services; but college representatives on the DES Standing Committee have been assured that proposed changes will not result in diminution of Council services to Lutheran higher education. As always, there is too much to do, and too little time and too few resources to accomplish all one desires.

Robert L. Anderson
Secretary-Treasurer

EXHIBIT A

LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Financial Report

December 31, 1972

I. **INCOME**	1972 Budget	1972 Actual
A. Balance on hand, January 1	$ 4,106.53	$ 7,281.53
B. Membership dues: 1971	3,600.00	225.00
1972	0.00	3,900.50
C. Commission on the Future receipts	0.00	2,000.00
D. Annual meeting fees: 1972	0.00	1,086.00
1973	0.00	1,075.60
E. Credit from LC/USA for Book and Subscription error	0.00	175.00
F. Interest, Time Certificates	50.00	152.50
TOTAL INCOME	$ 7,756.53	$15,896.13
II. **DISBURSEMENTS**		
A. Secretarial Services	0.00	0.00
B. Office Supplies	250.00	190.12
C. Duplicating & Printing:		
1971 — Proceedings	0.00	3,350.00
1972 — Proceedings & Duplication	1,900.00	1,016.43
D. Communications	150.00	125.46
E. Postage	225.00	114.12
F. Books & Subscriptions	0.00	0.00
G. Travel	1,000.00	1,062.59
H. Annual Meeting	2,000.00	2,232.47
I. Organizational Memberships	250.00	250.00
J. Bulk Mailing Costs	100.00	98.03
K. Contingency; Misc.	200.00	0.00
L. Commission on the Future	0.00	3,025.78
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	$ 6,075.00	$11,465.00
III. **BALANCE**	$ 1,681.53	$ 4,431.13

IV. **ADJUSTED BALANCE**	$ 1,681.53	$ 4,761.64*
Cash balance, December 31, 1972		$ 4,431.13
Accounts receivable:		
Commission on the Future income	$ 1,000.00	
Due from Lina Meyer Fund for balance of 1972 expenses	198.33	+1,198.33
Accounts payable:		
Commission on the Future meeting	602.82	
Interest due Lina Meyer Fund incorrectly credited to general fund	265.00	−867.82
Adjusted cash balance, December 31, 1972		$ 4,761.64*

*NOTE: It should be kept in mind that this adjusted balance is still somewhat inflated in that included are receipts for two annual meetings, but expenses for only the 1972 meeting.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

LINA R. MEYER LECTURE FUND

I. INCOME		
A. Balance, December 31, 1971	$ 5,229.62	
B. Interest income	82.55	
C. Investment income	85.00	$ 5,397.17
II. DISBURSEMENTS		
A. 1972 Lina R. Meyer Lecture	229.62	
B. 500 shares of Lutheran Brotherhood Income Fund	5,000.00	5,229.62
III. CASH BALANCE, December 31, 1972		$ 167.55
IV. ADJUSTMENTS		
A. Interest due from LECNA general fund incorrectly credited there		+265.00
B. Due general fund for balance of 1972 Lina R. Meyer Lecture		−198.33
ADJUSTED CASH BALANCE, December 31, 1972		$ 234.22

Book Value of Income Fund, $5,000.00

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

59th Annual Convention

1. Resolved:

That the Secretary of LECNA be directed to prepare written expressions of appreciation to the following:

1) Dr. Arthur O. Davidson, for his imaginative and dedicated leadership in his service as President of LECNA.
2) The program participants for their valuable contribution to a significant annual meeting, these to include Dr. Paul Heist; Dr. Norman Fintel; Dr. Charles Glock; and Mr. Howard Holcomb.
3) The officers and Board of Directors of LECNA for their continuing dedicated service on our behalf.

2. Resolved:

That LECNA express its sincere appreciation to Mr. Robert Anderson for his conscientious work and untiring efforts on our behalf.

3. Resolved:

That the Secretary of LECNA be directed to express written appreciation to our three Church bodies for their provision of $1,000 each to fund the initiatory meetings of the Commission on the Future, and that these expressions of thanks be directed to Dr. Arthur Ahlschwede, Dr. Norman Fintel, and Dr. Louis Almen.

4. Resolved:

That direct expression of appreciation be conveyed by the President of LECNA to LCUSA for the valuable staff service support; and that this expression be directed to Dr. Thomas Spitz with a request for his cooperation and support of LECNA and its programs.

5. Resolved:

That an expression of thanks again be directed to Mr. Howard Holcomb, Executive Associate of the Association of American Colleges for his continuing fine efforts in Washington, D. C.; for keeping us informed; and for his continuing enthusiasm in advancing the cause of Lutheran higher education within the context of his interest in higher education.

6. Resolved:

With respect to the Commission on the Future:

1) That LECNA give its support and encouragement to the Commission on the Future, commending Dr. Albert Huegli

for a preliminary report of the introductory conversations and organization of the Commission, this within the framework of the LECNA Resolution of February 4, 1972 which created the Commission.

2) Assuming the necessary financial commitments, that in addition LECNA and its member colleges support the work of the Commission with staff and a commitment to provide full and accurate data at the request of the Commission as it constructs an informational base and planning system.
3) That LECNA urge and encourage the colleges which are asked by the Commission on the Future to indeed serve as laboratories for the analysis of behavioral outcomes of education and their relationship to liberal and vocational education.
4) That the Commission on the Future develop the "Master Plan" as part of an on-going planning process and that planning documents and publications envision the maintenance of an on-going system to enhance and encourage decision-making by LECNA and its member colleges.
5) That the planning process take place in such a way that Lutheran higher education is maintained and extended as a vigorous part of higher education in general and private higher education in particular; and that the planning process also recognize the dynamics of the environmental influences and opportunities of the individual member colleges.

7. Resolved:

That LECNA seriously consider the reestablishment of a Lutheran college registry for prospective college teachers and administrators.

8. Resolved:

That prayer be directed to our Lord on behalf of Kent Knutson and in sympathetic support of his wife, Norma, and that our prayers be directed by President Oscar Anderson.

Respectively submitted,
Thomas H. Langevin, Chairman
L. Dale Lund
Harvey A. Stegemoeller

As adopted at annual meeting, January 13, 1973.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON
President, Wagner College

Vice-President

ELWIN D. FARWELL
President, Luther College

Secretary-Treasurer

ROBERT L. ANDERSON
Associate Executive Secretary, Division of Education Services
Lutheran Council in the USA, Washington, D. C.

Members-At-Large
1973 (Retiring)

FRANK R. BARTH
President, Gustavus Adolphus College

RALPH J. JALKANEN
President, Suomi College

JOE K. MENN
President, Texas Lutheran College

CHARLES M. COOPER
President, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary

1974

WALTER F. WOLBRECHT
President, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago

RAYMOND M. BOST
President, Lenoir Rhyne College

W. THEOPHIL JANZOW
President, Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebraska

1975

MORRIS A. ANDERSON
President, Luther College, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada

THOMAS H. LANGEVIN
President, Capital University

HARVEY A. STEGEMOELLER
President, Concordia College, St. Paul, Minnesota

INSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTS
LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA

FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

OSCAR A. ANDERSON, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn.
CLARENCE W. SORENSEN, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
CHARLES L. BALCER, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. D.
ARVIN W. HAHN, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan.
MARK A. MATHEWS, California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
THOMAS H. LANGEVIN, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio
HAROLD H. LENTZ, Carthage College, Kenosha, Wisc.
JOSEPH L. KNUTSON, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.
HARVEY A. STEGEMOELLER, Concordia College, St. Paul, Minn.
HERBERT G. BREDEMEIER, Acting, Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne, Ind.
CARL HALTER, Acting, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.
W. THEOPHIL JANZOW, Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebr.
EARL R. MEZOFF, Dana College, Blair, Nebr.
C. ARNOLD HANSON, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.
FRANK R. BARTH, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.
RAYMOND M. BOST, Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, N. C.
ELWIN D. FARWELL, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa
L. DALE LUND, Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Nebr.
JOHN H. MOREY, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
FREDRIC B. IRVIN, Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.
EUGENE W. WIEGMAN, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Wash.
PERRY F. KENDIG, Roanoke College, Salem, Va.
SIDNEY A. RAND, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
GUSTAVE W. WEBER, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.
JOE K. MENN, Texas Lutheran College, Sequin, Texas
CHAUNCEY G. BLY, Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.
CARL G. FJELLMAN, Upsala College, East Orange, N. J.
ALBERT G. HUEGLI, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON, Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.
JOHN W. BACHMAN, Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa
FRANK C. PETERS, Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, Ont., Can.
G. KENNETH ANDEEN, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio

JUNIOR COLLEGES

WILLIS L. WRIGHT, Alabama Lutheran Academy and College, Selma, Ala.
WILBUR E. BARNETT, Acting, California Concordia College, Oakland, Calif.
K. GLEN JOHNSON, Camrose Lutheran College, Camrose, Alta., Can.
LEROY TSCHATSCHULA, Acting, Concordia College, Austin, Tex.
ROBERT V. SCHNABEL, Concordia College, Bronxville, N. Y.
ROLAND A. FRANTZ, Concordia College, Edmonton, Alta., Can.
WALTER W. STUENKEL, Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wisc.
ERHARDT P. WEBER, Concordia College, Portland, Ore.
PAUL A. ZIMMERMAN, Concordia Lutheran Junior College, Ann Arbor, Mich.
BERNT C. OPSAL, Golden Valley Lutheran College, Minneapolis, Minn.
KARL F. LANGROCK, Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa
MORRIS ANDERSON, Luther College, Regina, Sask., Can.
J. P. WORTHINGTON, Luther College of the Bible and Liberal Arts, Teaneck, N. J.
MICHAEL J. STELMACHOWICZ, St. John's College, Winfield, Kan.
WALTER ROSIN, St. Paul's College, Concordia, Mo.
RALPH J. JALKANEN, Suomi College, Hancock, Mich.
PAUL D. MORK, Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa

BOARDS OF EDUCATION

A L C — Minneapolis, Minn.

NORMAN C. FINTEL, Board of College Education, Executive Director
WALTER R. WIETZKE, Board of Theological Education, Executive Director

L C A — New York, N. Y.

KENNETH C. SENFT, Division for Mission in North America, Executive Director
RUTH C. WICK, Department for Higher Education
LLOYD E. SHENEMAN, Division for Professional Leadership, Department for Theological Education, Director (Philadelphia)

L C - M S — St. Louis, Mo.

ARTHUR M. AHLSCHWEDE, Board for Higher Education, Executive Secretary

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS

Convention	Place	Date	President	Vice-President	Secretary	Treasurer
1st	Harrisburg, Pa.	June, 1910	P. M. Bikle	L. H. Schuh	F. B. Sawvell	
2nd	Gettysburg, Pa.	April, 1911	J. A. Haas		E. P. Manhart	
3rd	Springfield, O.	Dec., 1912	C. G. Heckert		C. T. Benze	Prof. Martzoff
		For the Years 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1917 no records are available				
4th	Maywood, Ill.	Jan., 1916	J. Henry Harms	G. A. Andreen	H. D. Hoover	Otto Mees
5th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1918	G. A. Andreen		H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
6th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1919	W. A. Granville	L. A. Vigness	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
7th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1920	L. A. Vigness	E. F. Pihlbald	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
8th	New York City	Jan., 1921	E. E. Stauffer	H. W. Elson	H. D. Hoover	J. A. Aasgaard
9th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1922	H. D. Hoover		R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
10th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1923	Otto Mees	H. D. Hoover	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
11th	New York City	Jan., 1924	J. F. Krueger	J. A. Aasgaard	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
12th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1925	L. W. Boe	O. J. Johnson	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
13th	New York City	Jan., 1926	G. A. Andreen	C. O. Solberg	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
14th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1927	R. E. Tulloss	E. F. Pihlbald	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
15th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1928	E. F. Pihlblad	J. N. Brown	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
16th	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Jan., 1929	J. N. Brown	W. P. Hieronymous	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
17th	Chicago, Ill.	Mar., 1930	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
18th	Indianapolis, Ind.	Jan., 1931	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
19th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1932	O. J. Johnson	Otto Proehl	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
20th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1933	J. C. K. Preus	Wm. Young	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
21st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1934	Wm. Young	C. Bergendoff	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
22nd	Atlanta, Ga.	Jan., 1935	Erland Nelson	J. Wargelin	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
23rd	New York City	Jan., 1936	H. W. A. Hanson	Arthur Wald	J. C. K. Preus	H. J. Arnold
24th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1937	Conrad Bergendoff	Mary Markley	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
25th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1938	Chas. J. Smith	C. M. Granskou	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
26th	Louisville, Ky.	Jan., 1939	C. M. Granskou	E. J. Braulick	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
27th	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1940	E. J. Braulick	J. C. Kinard	H. J. Arnold	
28th	Marion, Va.	June, 1941	J. C. Kinard	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	
29th	Baltimore, Md.	Jan., 1942	H. J. Arnold	V. K. Nikander	F. C. Wiegman	

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS, Continued

Convention	Place	Date	President	Vice-President	Secretary/Treasurer	Treasurer	Secretary and Executive Director
		1943	Omitted: War-time	Restrictions			
30th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1944	H. J. Arnold	J. C. Kinard	F. C. Wiegman		
31st	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1945	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	F. C. Wiegman		
32nd	Cleveland, O.	Jan., 1946	C. G. Shatzer	E. Lindquist	H. J. Arnold		
33rd	Boston, Mass.	Jan.. 1947	E. Lindquist	W. P. Hieronymous	H. J. Arnold		
34th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1948	W. P. Hieronymous	T. F. Gullixon	H. J. Arnold		
35th	New York City	Jan., 1949	J. N. Brown	H. L. Yochum	H. J. Arnold		
36th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1950	H. L. Yochum	L. M. Stavig	W. F. Zimmerman		
37th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1951	L. Tyson	E. M. Carlson	W. P. Hieronymous		
38th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1952	E. M. Carlson	R. E. Morton	Orville Dahl		
39th	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1953	R. E. Morton	C. H. Becker	Orville Dahl		
40th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1954	C. H. Becker	V. R. Cromer	Orville Dahl		
41st	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1955	V. R. Chomer	O. P. Kretzmann	Orville Dahl		
42nd	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1956	O. P. Kretzmann	C. C. Stoughton	Orville Dahl		
43rd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1957	C. C. Stoughton	E. B. Lawson	Orville Dahl		
44th	Miami, Fla.	Jan., 1958	E. B. Lawson	J. W. Ylvisaker	Gould Wickey		
45th	Kansas City, Mo.	Jan., 1959	J. W. Ylvisaker	M. Neeb	Gould Wickey		
46th	Boston, Mass.	Jan., 1960	M. J. Neeb	L. M. Stavig		A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
47th	Denver, Colo.	Jan., 1961	L. M. Stavig	H. S. Oberly		A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
48th	Cleveland, O.	Jan., 1962	H. S. Oberly	K. E. Mattson		A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
49th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1963	K. E. Mattson	A. O. Fuerbringer		A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
50th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1964	A. O. Fuerbringer	P. W. Dieckman		A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
51st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1965	P. W. Dieckman	R. L. Mortvedt		Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
52nd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1966	R. L. Mortvedt	A. N. Rogness		Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
53rd	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1967	A. N. Rogness	E. N. Jensen		Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
54th	Minneapolis, Minn.	Jan., 1968	E. Jensen	S. A. Rand		Howard Holcomb	Gould Wickey
					Secretary-Treasurer		
55th	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Jan., 1969	Sidney A. Rand	J. A. O. Preus		Howard Holcomb	
56th	Houston, Tex.	Jan., 1970	Albert G. Huegli	Sigvald Fauske		Howard Holcomb	
57th	Washington, D. C.	Feb., 1971	Albert G. Huegli	Arthur O. Davidson		Howard Holcomb	
58th	Washington, D. C.	Feb., 1972	Arthur O. Davidson	Elwin D. Farwell		Robert L. Anderson	
59th	San Francisco, Cal.	Jan., 1973	Elwin D. Farwell	Frank R. Barth		Robert L. Anderson	